

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

In re M. H. et al., Persons Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

B174729

(Super. Ct. No. CK45785)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT
OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Petitioner and Respondent,

v.

LAVANCE D. and TADDIE K. A.,

Appellants.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Zeke D. Zeidler, Judge. Affirmed.

Sharon S. Rollo, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Lavance D., Appellant.

Mary E. Handy, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Taddie K. A., Appellant.

Lloyd W. Pellman, County Counsel of Los Angeles County, for
Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

This is a so-called *Sade C.* case. Appellant, Lavance D., father of S. A. D., and de facto father of T. A. and M. H., and appellant Taddie K. A., mother of all three children, filed separate appeals from the order of the juvenile court terminating their parental and de facto parental rights over the three minors. We affirm.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

We appointed counsel to represent mother and father in this appeal. After examination of the record, both attorneys notified this court in writing, pursuant to *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, that counsel were unable to file opening briefs. By notices dated June 17, 2004, and June 21, 2004, we advised father and mother, respectively, to submit any contentions or issues they wished this court to consider within 30 days. We affirm.

Father filed a supplemental brief on July 14, 2004, and mother filed her supplemental brief on July 15, 2004. We have reviewed the letters and the juvenile court record.

DISCUSSION

It is a well-settled principle of appellate practice and of constitutional doctrine that judgments and orders of the trial court are presumed to be correct and the party challenging them must affirmatively show reversible error. (*Walling v. Kimball* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 364, 373; *Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) We conclude that, in pursuing their appeal, neither parent has demonstrated error.

In her supplemental brief, mother states that she is in a drug rehabilitation program until October 2005, and she is “willing to do whatever the courts decide is in our best interest.” Mother has failed to demonstrate error. Mother was entitled to a maximum of 18 months of reunification services. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 361.5, subds. (a)(1), (a)(2) & (a)(3), par. 4.) That time period has long

since passed. Meanwhile, mother has yet to complete her current drug rehabilitation program.

Father/de facto father filed a four and one-half page supplemental brief listing his six grievances. None of the grievances has merit and thus, father/de facto father has failed to demonstrate that the juvenile court committed error.

Accordingly, we affirm the order terminating the parental rights of mother and father/de facto father.

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

ALDRICH, J.

We concur:

KLEIN, P. J.

CROSKEY, J.